

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/877,182	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIEBLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Arlen Soderquist	<b>Art Unit</b> 1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist.

(3) Michael E Monaco.

(2) Daniel C. Liebler.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 March 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1 specifically.

Identification of prior art discussed: the applied references.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ARLEN SODERQUIST  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the references relative to the language of claim 1. Examiner agrees that the disclosed invention is different from that taught by the applied references. Discussed whether the references compare the characteristics to actual mass spectra of theoretical spectra based on sequences in a database that have the molecular weight of the peak in the mass spectra. Examiner will consider the response when filed .